Man has his future within him, dynamically active at this present moment.
—A. H. MASLOW

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 54 APRIL, 1966 NUMBER 6

THE FORWARD IMPULSE

IN the beginning there was only H.P.B. Then there were H.P.B. and Olcott and, soon after, Judge. The object was to root in the Western world the nucleus of a brotherhood of man. The means were the teaching of the Wisdom-Religion and those associations for study and work through which the reciprocal processes of individual growth and promulgation take place.

The world has seen many such efforts to establish living centers that would serve as the matrices of human evolution. The first cities, it is said, were intended to be the outer environment of schools that taught the sacred science. Ancient social orders were ruled by king-initiates who knew the function of daily life activities in behalf of the growth of the soul. Later there were temples where aspirants might begin to find their way. Gurus could be sought out, wise men who were willing to stand *in loco parentis* to those who believed themselves ready to seek a new birth. Then, in Greece, there were the Mystery Schools—places of instruction in the archetypal meanings of cosmic process, giving light on the ordeals of human life. After the Mystery Schools came schools of philosophy, Plato's method of conceptual explanation and the foundation of intellectual life in the West. With the onset of darkening cycles, the Movement went underground. Secrets were cloaked in obscurities of legend and symbol. To the natural obstacle-courses set by the limitations of the individual psyche were added the barriers of cultural delusion

and institutional inversions of the evolutionary path. In time the very processes of history were coarsened into exoteric confrontations which had little connection with the trials and awakenings of the inner life. Partially intuitive men, blinded by the psychological mutilations of the age, turned fragmentary insights into desperate partisan doctrines. The idea of the Way, and even memory that it had once been known, died out in the West. Shadowed caricatures of the quest for truth became the vehicles of angry revolt. Ethics were intellectualized, losing touch with daily moral life and individual decision. Evolution became a physical conception, truth an abstract speculation, and love a mechanism of biological need. In time men knew only local or class alliances for self-interest. In the world of learning, half-truths became the order of intellectual discovery. The transmission of the intuitive wisdom of the race fell into ignorant hands and it was understood no more.

So, at a time long before many outward signs of awakening had appeared, H.P.B. came to create the matrices of future growth. She worked with the mind of the race as she found it. She let a society be formed. Great, universal principles were declared at its beginning. She taught a few individuals what they could learn. She set an example of absolute commitment so rare, so unremembered by the West, that it could hardly be recognized. Judge, as rare, no doubt, in the uncompromising quality of his devotion, widened the range of practical example by the simplicity of his undertakings. Men wondered about him—Can such things be? they asked—and they saw they could. Simple people made a wonderful discovery about human beings—that even if they could not be "perfect," they could keep on working and trying to be faithful to an ideal and to one another. They found that they could incarnate the principle of loyalty, regardless of their personal limitations. They made mistakes, but they could also remedy them. The secret was to preserve that attitude of mind which makes one able to learn from his mistakes.

So, in the progress of time, something of the mighty art was regained. Its practice was humble, its fruits hardly seen, yet essential modes of the transmission of truth, from one generation to another, had been found again, although what had been learned would hardly bear close definition. The delicate interchanges and subtle balances among people working together might not be the same as in the past, yet they would accomplish the same embodiments of

experience, facilitate the same collaboration among minds turned in the same direction.

These natural methods, it seems, can never survive vulgarization. Like the nuances of a dream, or the insights of individual inspiration, they fade into mechanical imitations in the presence of acquisitive analysis. Yet the framework of their operations can be described and some general principles made known. Judge spoke often in his *Letters* of these lines of work, and of the guardian conceptions of the integrity of Theosophical education. He made it plain that individuals need to learn how to generate and give circulation to what was once the atmosphere of ancient institutions. To expect, now, that institutions can contain processes that the law of evolution has placed in individual hands would be to turn back the hands of the clock of Karma. It cannot be done. A vast decentralization of responsibility is one of the meanings of the further incarnation of Manas, and the cohesive forces of the Movement, instead of lying in formal association, must now rise in the moral intelligence and self-restraint of individual aspirants to truth.

Is it not clear that this is the need, not only of the Theosophical Movement, but of all the world? And where else can it begin, save in those small but potent associations of human beings who attempt to embody, consciously and as they can, the forward impulse of cyclic evolution?

THE DYNAMIC CENTER

Under today's disorders there is something at work among the nations whose great importance has not yet been adequately realized —the need of men for a community to live in and live with. The hope is vague, unsaid, and unformulated, but the need is great, and there is something in our hearts which troubles us that we have lost what was once so beautifully called "the commonweal."

I suspect that if this open wound is to heal, it will have to heal like all wounds from the bottom, and that we shall have to begin at the beginning with the family and its obligations, with the village and its responsibilities, and with our universal and neglected duty to the earth.

—HENRY BESTON: *Northern Farm*

letters • questions • comment

There is frequent allusion by platform speakers to Prometheus—his tortures, his struggles, his endurance, etc.—but nothing is said about another aspect of Prometheus' character that is emphasized in the original myth as recounted by both Hesiod and Gayley: Prometheus' trickery, his cunning. (In fact, Prometheus was called "the cunning trickster.") Prometheus was not punished for his original impudence in taking the fire without permission, though Zeus was naturally infuriated by it and was looking for an opportunity to punish Prometheus. This came when, during a conference between gods and men to determine the prerogatives of each, Prometheus tricked Zeus into taking the bones of the sacrificial bull, leaving the palatable portions for men. Zeus retaliated by taking the fire from mankind, whereupon Prometheus stole *it in a "hollow tube." Only then did Zeus punish Prometheus* directly, *by having him chained to the rock, where he had to endure endless torture until Hercules (the Saviour) released him.*

It seems to me there must be a great deal more to this myth than is usually suggested. Can you elaborate?

Comment on this question takes the student into that uncertain but intriguing area of myth, allegory, and legend which has occupied scholars all down the centuries. Precisely because this phase of human expression is, in a sense, indefinable, it is one that continues to attract the inquiring mind. In fact, both higher and lower Manas as well as the intuitive faculty can be applied in such a study. Hence it should be apparent that there is no conclusive or final resolution to a problem presented in the guise of a literary fable, a truth concealed by allegory.

In using a symbol to cover or disguise a truth, its creator achieves more than one result. The initial effect is to obscure or hide that truth from the casual and uncritical gaze. But, in addition, we find that a symbolic statement, because of its non-specific nature, is capable of many interpretations. It is evident from writings on the subject that any one symbol can be understood on various levels of

comprehension. Certainly the idea of a God or gods is universally diffused, yet not limited to any one concept. Only the closed mind will deny the validity of the basic idea because it is expressed in differing forms. We should not say, *This* idea of God is right, *that* one wrong, but more properly, This concept represents a certain level of understanding and as the individual grows and changes, so will his understanding. So, because of its very flexibility and adaptability, the allegory or myth is most useful as a vehicle for ideas which concern the whole of mankind throughout its entire evolution. The more basic the concept, the more various the guises under which it may appear, or the more levels at which it can be understood.

This lengthy preamble brings us to a consideration of what is, on the surface, a story from the Greek pantheon. In her *Mythology,* Edith Hamilton writes:

> We do not know when these stories were first told in their present shape; but whenever it was, primitive life had been left far behind. The myths as we have them are the creation of great poets. . . . The Greeks made gods in their own image. Saint Paul said the invisible must be understood by the visible. That was not a Hebrew idea, it was Greek. . . . Greek mythology is largely made up of stories about gods and goddesses, but it must not be read as a kind of Greek Bible, an account of the Greek religion. According to the most modern idea, a real myth has nothing to do with religion. It is an explanation of something in nature; how, for instance, any and everything in the universe came into existence: men, animals, this or that tree or flower, the sun, the moon, the stars, storms, eruptions, earthquakes, all that is and all that happens. . . . There are many so-called myths which explain nothing at all. These tales are pure entertainment, the sort of thing people would tell each other on a long winter's evening. The stories are early literature as well as early science. But religion is there, too. In the background, to be sure, but nevertheless plain to see. From Homer through the tragedians and even later, there is a deepening realization of what human beings need and what they must have in their gods. . . . The Greeks from the earliest mythologists on had a perception of the divine and the excellent. Their longing for them was great enough to make them never give up laboring to see them clearly.

So much for Greek myths in general.

Our questioner is concerned with the story of Prometheus, son of a Titan and aid to Zeus in his battle against these gods. Are we to

view him as a hero, true benefactor of mankind? This aspect is expressed by Byron in his poem *Prometheus*:

> Thy Godlike crime was to be kind,
> To render with thy precepts less
> The sum of human wretchedness,
> And strengthen Man with his own mind. . . .
> Thou art a symbol and a sign
> To Mortals of their fate and force:
> Like thee, Man is in part divine,
> A troubled stream from a pure source;
> And Man in portions can foresee
> His own funereal destiny;
> His wretchedness, and his resistance,
> And his sad unallied existence:
> To which his Spirit may oppose
> Itself—and equal to all woes,
> And a firm will, and a deep sense,
> Which even in torture can descry
> Its own concenter'd recompense,
> Triumphant where it dares defy,
> And making Death a Victory.

The questioner notes that the character of Prometheus is not represented consistently by various versions of the tale. Is he indeed the "cunning trickster" or is he rather the benefactor of mankind? This paradox can be resolved if we will accept the theory of varying interpretations of the symbol. If we see the stolen fire simply as fire and mankind as primitive man benefiting by this element so essential to his physical development, is this to say that the end justifies the means, that the welfare of the many is more important than the fact that an ethical principle has been violated? One can see political overtones if this position is taken. Then, shall we see "fire" as the fire of mind which needs a spark in order to kindle the awaiting fuel? When this fire is lighted, though at first but a flickering flame, it has potentiality of growing until it rivals that splendid light of mind possessed by the gods (or god-like men). Would any true god wish to deny this boon to mankind? An overtone here is of Zeus as a member of the priestly hierarchies.

It is evident that when we try to discern the significance of Prometheus, Zeus, fire, mankind, the result will not be definitive but rather a series of expanding meanings. That this approach is in accord with theosophical ideas is brought out by H. P. Blavatsky in her consideration of Prometheus. In discussing both Prometheus and Phoroneus she states that the names bear "not one, nor even

two, but a series of esoteric meanings." If this can be said of a name, how much more must it also apply to the story of the hero and the interpretation of his actions. Her account of "this grandest of all myths" says of Prometheus:

> He is the representation of humanity—active, industrious, intelligent, but at the same time ambitious, which aims at equalling divine powers. . . . Prometheus having endowed man with that "wisdom which ministers to physical well-being," but the lower aspect of *manas* of the animal (*Kama*) having remained unchanged, instead of "an untainted mind, heaven's first gift" there was created the eternal vulture of the ever unsatisfied desire, of regret and despair coupled with "the dreamlike feebleness that fetters the blind race of mortals" unto the day when Prometheus is released by his heaven-appointed deliverer, Herakles. (*S.D.* II, 525; 412.)

An interesting suggestion is that by interfering with normal development, the gift of Prometheus became a curse. H.P.B. writes:

> It was not in the programme of natural development that man—higher animal though he may be—should become at once—intellectually, spiritually, and physically—the demi-god he is on earth, while his physical frame remains weaker and more helpless and ephemeral than that of almost any huge mammal. . . . For the Host that incarnated in a portion of humanity, though led to it by Karma or *Nemesis*, preferred free-will to passive slavery, intellectual self-conscious pain and even torture to inane, imbecile, instinctual beatitude. . . . While saving man from mental darkness, they inflicted upon him the tortures of the self-consciousness of his responsibility—the result of his free will—besides every ill which mortal man and flesh are heir to. (*S.D.* II, 420-21.)

As to the nature of Zeus and his relation to mankind, the statement is made that he represents the "Host of the primeval progenitors, of the PITAR, the 'Fathers' who created man senseless and without any mind." They are "spiritually lower, but physically stronger, than the Prometheans." H.P.B. sees Zeus as both god and tyrant, quoting from Mrs. Anna Swanwick's *The Dramas of Æschylus*:

> We have, thus, the Titan, the symbol of finite reason and free will (of intellectual humanity, or the higher aspect of *Manas*), depicted *as the sublime philanthropist*, while Zeus, the supreme deity of Hellas, is portrayed as the cruel and obdurate despot, a character peculiarly revolting to Athenian sentiment. (*S.D.* II, 412 fn.)

She then explains that "The 'Supreme Deity' bears, in every ancient Pantheon—including that of the Jews—a *dual* character, composed of light and shadow."

The student will do well to read carefully the references in *The Secret Doctrine* on the subject of Prometheus for further information. The entire panorama of evolution as suggested by this myth is a vast one. A final quotation will add a hopeful note:

> Man will rebecome the *free* Titan of old, but not before cyclic evolution has re-established the broken harmony between the two natures—the terrestrial and the divine; after which he becomes impermeable to the lower titanic forces, invulnerable in his personality, and immortal in his individuality, which cannot happen before every animal element is eliminated from his nature. (*S.D.* II, 422.)

VIABLE IDEAS

Philosophical poetry plays a very special part between philosophy and religion and science. It may now be said that what was once called "philosophy" no longer exists. The name has remained as a general label covering various kinds of researches such as sociology, psychology, logic, etc. Nothing corresponds any longer to what, scientifically speaking, formed the connecting link—metaphysics, of necessity, presented, with an accuracy which rendered them unacceptable, ideas which have only an indefinable existence, which are only suppositions, not even hypotheses, which often admit of contradiction without being shaken by it. Metaphysics carried into the scientific realm conceptions which really belong to the domain of the will. These metaphysical ideas cannot claim to have a place in science, but is that a reason for refusing to consider them? They belong to another order of truth: artistic truth. They are in a latent condition only, in a state of possibility.

—DENIS SAURAT: *Gods of the People*

MEDITATION

A MAN may well feel a sense of shame if faced with the fact that he is unable to keep his mind from responding to the incessant parade of nonessential, meaningless, and senseless thoughts, objects, influences, and suggestions that are continually competing to manipulate his attention during all his waking hours. But only the "self-governed sages" are able to keep the mind from yielding to such influences. Let anyone who doubts this try keeping his mind in its "unmoved state" for only a few minutes.

If we apply thoughtful consideration to a few verses of the *Dhammapada,* the importance of mind-control will be obvious. Buddha, for example, is quoted as saying:

> All that we are is the result of what we have thought; all that we are is founded on our thoughts and formed of our thoughts.
>
> Rains pour into an ill-thatched house; desires pour into an ill-trained mind.
>
> He who controls his mind escapes the bondage of Mara. The Mind is incorporeal, moves alone, travels far and rests in the cave of the heart.
>
> Whatever an enemy may do to an enemy, whatever a hater may do to a hater, a wrongly directed mind will do to us greater harm.
>
> Not a mother, not a father, not any kindred can do much; a well-directed mind does us greater service.

The importance of control of the "thinking principle" cannot be overestimated or exaggerated. *The Bhagavad-Gita* makes the same emphasis:

> *Krishna*: The performance of works is by far inferior to mental devotion, O despiser of wealth. Seek an asylum, then, in this mental devotion, which is knowledge; for the miserable and unhappy are those whose impulse to action is found in its reward. But he who by means of Yoga is mentally devoted dismisses alike successful and unsuccessful results, being beyond them.
>
> *Arjuna*: O slayer of Madhu, on account of the restlessness of the mind, I do not perceive any possibility of steady continuance in this yoga of equanimity which thou hast declared. For indeed,

O Krishna, the mind is full of agitation, turbulent, strong, and obstinate. I believe the restraint of it to be as difficult as that of the wind.

Krishna: Without doubt, O thou of mighty arms, the mind is restless and hard to restrain; but it may be restrained, O son of Kunti, by practice and absence of desire. Yet in my opinion this divine discipline called yoga is very difficult for one who hath not his soul in his own control; yet it may be acquired through proper means and by one who is assiduous and controlleth his heart.

Arjuna: What end, O Krishna, doth that man attain who, although having faith, hath not attained to perfection in his devotion because his unsubdued mind wandered from the discipline? Doth he, fallen from both, like a broken cloud without any support, become destroyed, O strong-armed one, being deluded in the path of the Supreme Spirit? Thou, Krishna, shouldst completely dispel this doubt for me, for there is none other to be found able to remove it.

Krishna: Such a man, O son of Pritha, doth not perish here or hereafter. . . . Being born again he comes in contact with the knowledge which belonged to him in his former body, and from that time he struggles more diligently towards perfection, O son of Kuru. For even unwittingly, by reason of that past practice, he is led and works on.

Considering in the same way the first sixteen aphorisms of Patanjali, we are apt to feel that here is a system of mind-control that will surely "work," and that from here on out, it all depends on the student's determination. If this quality is kept up to pitch, he *will make it*. So have said all the Teachers who have earned the veneration of mankind.

Beginning with the seventeenth aphorism, Patanjali takes up the subject of the attainment of meditation, seeming to imply that the preceding aphorisms were but preparatory to this end. We can form some idea of the importance of meditation from Krishna's statement to Arjuna in the sixth chapter of the Gita: "The man of meditation is superior to the man of penance and to the man of learning and also to the man of action; wherefore, O Arjuna, resolve to become a man of meditation."

Meditation would seem to mean using the creative force of the mind to throw the light that comes from within on the problems that confront us, instead of becoming passive and allowing it to respond to the panorama of trivia constantly being paraded before the mind.

As the Buddha says, actions based on this kind of negative thinking "will be followed by pain, as the wheel of the cart follows the hoof of the ox that draws it." To avoid this calls for a determination that will not be denied.

How do we get this determination? By use of the will. Patanjali says we gain it by exercise and dispassion. "Exercise is uninterrupted and repeated effort," and "dispassion is the overcoming of desire." No will, no success.

Patanjali's sixteenth aphorism says that "dispassion carried to the utmost, is indifference regarding all else than soul, and this indifference arises from a knowledge of soul as distinguished from all else." It *isn't* easy. One of the Adepts said in a letter to Sinnett: "There is no other such difficult struggle." But no *other* struggle brings such great reward.

Both Mr. Judge and Mr. Crosbie said "aim high." All effort of the present will be carried over and conserved for use in a future incarnation. Again, determination *will do it,* if we never quit trying.

Try, try, ever keep trying.

Lines of Endeavor

If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music which he hears, however measured or far away.

If one advances confidently in the direction of his dreams, and endeavors to live the life which he has imagined, he will meet with a success unexpected in common hours. He will put some things behind, will pass an invisible boundary; new, universal, and more liberal laws will begin to establish themselves around and within him; or the old laws be expanded, and interpreted in his favor in a more liberal sense, and he will live with the license of a higher order of beings. In proportion as he simplifies his life, the laws of the universe will appear less complex, and solitude will not be solitude, nor poverty poverty, nor weakness weakness. If you have built castles in the air, your work need not be lost; that is where they should be. Now put the foundations under them.

—Henry David Thoreau: *Walden*

YOUTH FORUM

The question of how to obtain a true education is so important and so pressing today that anyone concerned with his individual growth must have asked how and where he will get such instruction. Today it doesn't seem that you can really go *anywhere to be taught. Either you become a number in one of the large IBM-card universities or you try to chart your own course (which is almost as frustrating). In the past there was a relationship of trust, commitment and devotion between student and teacher which seems almost nonexistent today. Is it possible or desirable for a pupil to establish such a tie with a teacher?*

In this question there is implicit a confusion so common and so telling that it needs attention. Men long ago acquired the habit of thinking it possible to get an education from "somewhere." Next they probably met in buildings, then built schoolrooms, and finally the sanctuary of the university was born. Then, at last, they could truly "go" somewhere to be taught. With the passage of time the appeal of such a place has reached tremendous proportions. Men from everywhere gather together in a sincere effort to learn one thing or another—and they naturally do learn. If you add together the potential of each of the students and professors and project it into an institution, then there is little wonder that the university has become the potent force which it is.

But it is the people that you meet in school who are important. It is individuals who have ideals and ideas—there is little organism of institutional thought today. If our education was simply an experiment in living and exchanging ideas, then perhaps there would be no need for student strikes and sit-ins or the question which opened this discussion. But much contemporary education is not so simple. It is filled with lectures which are more often tranquilizers than stimulants, and with courses geared to the average student when there is no such thing as an average student. Yes, there are people who get C's on a standard grade curve but they range from the genius who couldn't care less about the class to the timid soul

who is the living offprint of some professor's compromises and concessions. One spontaneous bull session is often more enlightening and worth more in sharpening intellectual abilities than all the hours spent listening to lectures.

Paul Goodman has a lot to say on these counts. In a dialogue with Alvin Duskin, Goodman tells how many of the problems we have in administration and organization in the United States do not exist in many present-day European universities:

> People don't just go to get a degree, they go to study with Professor so-and-so. So how is a class chosen? You talk with Professor so-and-so and he says, "Yes, come and I'll teach you," or "No, I don't want you." And then if he's a kindly man he says, "I don't want to teach you but look, I've talked to you. Why don't you go down to Marburg? You're just the kind of student that so-and-so likes. See, to me you're a pain in the neck." And that's what admissions consist of in these schools. The teachers decide who they'll teach. Who else would they want to teach?

This brings us to our original question on the value of devotion to a teacher. If a student cannot find teachers that he would really like to study with, what is the use of going to school? Perhaps the interest in Zen Buddhism today is partly a recognition that the pupil-teacher bond is wrapped in a mystery of growth and change. In the presence of a Zen master the disciple was determined to learn; and by the force of his wanting to know what the master knew, he would learn. The teacher was never presumptuous enough to assume that he could teach or tell the pupil anything. So, instead of having a course in philosophy, one in psychology, and one in history, there was a continuous and appropriate exchange of the master's vision and insight for the devotion of the student. A story told by Eugen Herrigel illustrates this very well. A disciple came to a master to learn the art of fencing. The master, who was in retirement in a mountain hut, agreed. The master had the pupil gather wood, draw water, split wood, cook, and generally look after household affairs. Since there was no regular or technical training in fencing, the young man became dissatisfied. He had not come to work as a servant, but to learn the art of swordsmanship. One day he asked the master to teach him. Mr. Herrigel continues the story:

> The result was that the young man could not do any piece of work with any feeling of safety. For when he began to cook rice early in the morning, the master would appear and strike him from behind with a stick. When he was in the midst of his

sweeping, he would be feeling the same blow from somewhere, from an unknown direction. He had no peace of mind, he had to be always on the *qui vive*. Some years passed before he could successfully dodge the blow from whatever source it might come. But the master was not quite satisfied with him yet. One day the master was found cooking his own vegetables over an open fire. The pupil took it into his head to avail himself of this opportunity. Taking up his big stick, he let it fall on the head of the master, who was then stooping over the cooking pan to stir its contents. But the pupil's stick was caught by the master with the cover of the pan. This opened the pupil's mind to the secrets of the art, which had hitherto been kept from him. He then for the first time really appreciated the unparalleled kindness of the master.

Such anecdotes dramatize the immediate and living character of at least one kind of education. They illustrate that there is no difference between the student's potential and the expression of that potential by the teacher. Here student, teacher and knowledge are one. Education is not some remote process that one prepares for, nor is a teacher some separate person who unfolds the mysteries of life. The teacher is an extension of the pupil; and the choice of a teacher reflects one's capacity to see himself mirrored in the thought and life of another person.

INNER KNOWLEDGE

I believe that our own experience instructs us that the secret of Education lies in respecting the pupil. It is not for you to choose what he shall know, what he shall do. It is chosen and foreordained, and he only holds the key to his own secret. By your tampering and thwarting and too much governing he may be hindered from his end and kept out of his own. Respect the child. Wait and see the new product of Nature. Nature loves analogies, but not repetitions. Respect the child. Be not too much his parent. Trespass not on his solitude.

Let him study the art of solitude, yield as gracefully as he can to his destiny. Heaven often protects valuable souls charged with great secrets, great ideas, by long shutting them up with their own thoughts. And the most genial and amiable of men must alternate society with solitude, and learn its severe lessons.

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON: *Education*

HUMAN TYPE AND FORM

> The MONAD has, during the cycle of its incarnations, to reflect in itself every *root-form* of each kingdom.
>
> —*The Secret Doctrine*

THERE can be no objective form on Earth (nor in the Universe either), without its astral prototype being first formed in Space. From Phidias down to the humblest workman in the ceramic art—a sculptor has to create first of all a model in his mind, then sketch it in one and two dimensional lines, and then only can he reproduce it in a three dimensional or objective figure. And if human mind is a living demonstration of such successive stages in the process of evolution—how can it be otherwise when NATURE'S MIND and creative powers are concerned?

As regards the evolution of mankind, the Secret Doctrine teaches (a) the simultaneous evolution of seven human groups on seven different portions of our globe; (b) the birth of the *astral,* before the *physical* body; the former being a model for the latter; and (c) that man, in this Round, preceded every mammalian—the anthropoids included—in the animal kingdom. The *Natures* of the seven hierarchies or classes of Pitris or Dhyan Chohans compose our nature and bodies. Paracelsus calls them the *Flagae;* the Christians, the "Guardian Angels"; the Occultists, the "Ancestors, the Pitris"; they are the *sixfold* Dhyan Chohans, having the six spiritual Elements in the composition of their bodies—in fact, men, minus the physical body.

The evolution of man, the microcosm, is analogous to that of the Universe, the macrocosm. His evolution stands between that of the latter and that of the animal, for which man, in his turn, is a macrocosm. Man was the storehouse, so to speak, of *all the seeds of life* for this Round, vegetable and animal alike. Man—or rather his Monad—has existed on this earth from the very beginning of this Round. But, up to our own Fifth Race, the external shapes which covered those divine astral doubles changed and consolidated with

---

NOTE.—This collation from *The Secret Doctrine* will provide helpful points in connection with the item on Hibben's *Digging Up America* which appeared in March Lookout.

every sub-race; the form and physical structure of the fauna changing at the same time, as they had to be adapted to the ever-changing conditions of life on this globe during the geological periods of its formative cycle. And thus shall they go on changing with every Root-Race and *every chief sub-race* down to the last one of the Seventh in this Round.

It may be complained by some that too little is said of the physical, *human* side of the extinct races, in this history of their growth and evolution. Much more might be said assuredly, if simple prudence did not make us hesitate at the threshold of every new revelation. That which finds its possibility and landmarks in the discoveries of modern science, is given: all that of which exact knowledge knows nothing and upon which it is unable to speculate—and therefore denies as facts in nature—is withheld. But, even such statements as these—*e.g.*, that of all the mammalians, man was the earliest; that it is man who is the indirect ancestor of the Apes; and that he was a kind of Cyclops in days of old—will also be contested, yet, scientists will never be able to prove—except to their own satisfaction—that *it was not so*. Nor can they admit that the first two races of men were too ethereal and phantom-like in their constitution, organism, and *shape*, even to be called physical men. For, if they do, it will be found that this is one of the reasons why their relics can never be expected to be exhumed among other fossils. Nevertheless all this is maintained.

The human form—so called because it is the vehicle (under whatever shape) of the *divine* man—is, as so intuitionally remarked by the author of "Esoteric Studies," the *new type*, at the beginning of every Round, "as man can never be, so he has never been, manifested in the shape belonging to the animal kingdom *in esse*." The author proceeds, "he never formed part of that kingdom. Derived, only derived, from the most finished class of the latter, a new human form must always have been the *new* type of the cycle. The human shape, in one ring (?), as I imagine, becomes cast-off clothes in the next; it is then appropriated by the highest order in the servant-kingdom below." Every living creature and thing on earth, including man, evolved from *one common primal form*. Physical man must have passed through the same stages of the evolutionary process in the various modes of procreation as other animals have: he must have *divided* himself; the hermaphrodite, have given birth *parthogenetically* (on the immaculate principle) to his young ones;

the next stage would be the *oviparous*—at first "without any fructifying element," then "with the help of the fertility spore"; and only after the final and definite evolution of both sexes, would he become a distinct "male and female," when reproduction through sexual union would grow into universal law. So far, all this is scientifically proven.

How was the separation of sexes effected? it is asked. Are we to believe in the old Jewish fable of the rib of Adam yielding Eve? Even such belief is more logical and reasonable than the descent of man from the Quadrumana without any reservation; as the former hides an esoteric truth under a fabulous version, while the latter conceals no deeper fact than a desire to force upon mankind a materialistic fiction. The rib is bone, and when we read in Genesis that Eve was made out of the rib, it means only that the *Race with bones* was produced out of a previous Race and Races, which were "boneless." This is an esoteric tenet spread far and wide, as it is almost universal under its various forms. A Tahitian tradition states that man was created out of *Araea,* "red Earth." Taaroa, the creative power, the chief god, "put man to sleep for long years, for several lives," which means racial periods, and is a reference to his *mental sleep,* as shown elsewhere. During that time the deity pulled an *Ivi* (bone) out of man and she became a woman. Nevertheless, whatever the allegory may mean, even its exoteric meaning necessitates a *divine* Builder of man—"a Progenitor."

We reject every groundless and baseless tradition, which, having outgrown strict allegory and symbolism, has found acceptance in exoteric creeds. But that which is preserved in *unanimous* traditions, only the wilfully blind could reject. Hence we believe in races of beings other than our own in far remote geological periods; in races of ethereal, following *incorporeal, "Arupa,"* men, with form but no solid substance, giants who preceded us pygmies; in dynasties of divine beings, those Kings and Instructors of the Third Race in arts and sciences, compared with which our little modern science stands less chance than elementary arithmetic with geometry.

The whole personnel of the Brahmanas and Puranas—the Rishis, Prajapatis, Manus, their wives and progeny—belong to that prehuman period. All these are the *Seed* of Humanity, so to speak. It is around these "Sons of God," the "Mind born" astral children of Brahma, that our physical frames have grown and developed to what they are now. For, the Puranic histories of all those men are

those of our Monads, in their various and numberless incarnations on this and other spheres, events perceived by the "Siva eye" of the ancient Seers, (the "third eye" of our Stanzas) and described allegorically. Later on, they were disfigured for Sectarian purposes; mutilated, but still left with a considerable ground-work of truth in them. Nor is the philosophy less profound in such allegories for being so thickly veiled by the overgrowth of fancy.

Evolution in general, events, mankind, and everything else in Nature proceed in cycles. We have spoken of seven Races, five of which have nearly completed their earthly career, and have claimed that every Root-Race, with its sub-races and innumerable family divisions and tribes, was entirely distinct from its preceding and succeeding races. The human Races are born one from the other, grow, develop, become old, and die. Their sub-races and nations follow the same rule. What will be most contested by scientific authorities is the a-sexual Race, the Second, the fathers of the "Sweat-born" so-called, and perhaps still more the Third Race, the "Egg-born" androgynes. These two modes of procreation are the most difficult to comprehend, especially for the Western mind.

Consider the first stages of the development of a germ-cell. Its *nucleus* grows, changes, and forms a double cone or spindle, *within* the cell. This spindle approaches the surface of the cell, and one half of it is *extruded* in the form of what are called the *"polar cells."* These polar cells *now* die, and the embryo develops from the growth and segmentation of the remaining part of the nucleus which is *nourished* by the substance of the cell. Then why could not beings have lived thus, and been created in *this* way—at the very beginning of *human and mammalian evolution?* This may, perhaps, serve as an analogy to give some idea of the process by which the Second Race was formed from the First.

When the season of reproduction arrives, the *sub*-astral *"extrudes"* a miniature of itself from the egg of surrounding aura. This germ grows and feeds on the aura till it becomes fully developed, when it gradually separates from its parent, carrying with it its own sphere of aura; just as we see living cells reproducing their like by growth and subsequent division into two. The analogy with the *"polar cells"* would seem to hold good, since their death would *now* correspond to the change introduced by the separation of the sexes, when gestation *in utero, i.e. within the cell*, became the rule. Primeval human hermaphrodites are a fact in Nature well known to the

ancients, and form one of Darwin's greatest perplexities. Yet there is certainly no impossibility, but, on the contrary, a great probability that hermaphroditism existed in the evolution of the early races; while on the grounds of analogy, and on that of the existence of one universal law in physical evolution, acting indifferently in the construction of plant, animal, and man, it must be so.

The Third-Race-mankind is the most mysterious of all the hitherto developed five Races. The mystery of the "How" of the generation of the distinct sexes must, of course, be very obscure here, as it is the business of an embryologist and a specialist, the present work giving only faint outlines of the process. But it is evident that the units of the Third Race humanity began to separate in their pre-natal shells, or eggs, and to issue out of them as distinct male and female babes, after the appearance of its early progenitors. And, as time rolled on its geological periods, the newly born sub-races began to lose their natal capacities. Toward the end of the fourth sub-race, the babe lost its faculty of walking as soon as liberated from its shell, and by the end of the fifth, mankind was born under the same conditions and by the same identical process as our historical generations. This required, of course, millions of years.

But with the Fourth Race we reach the purely human period. Those who were hitherto semi-divine Beings, self-imprisoned in bodies which were human only in appearance, became physiologically changed and took unto themselves wives who were entirely human and fair to look at, but in whom *lower, more material,* though sidereal, beings had incarnated. These beings in female forms (Lilith is the prototype of these in the Jewish traditions) are called in the esoteric accounts "Khado" (Dakini, in Sanskrit). Allegorical legends call the chief of these Liliths, *Sangye Khado* (Buddha Dakini, in Sanskrit); all are credited with the art of "walking in the air," and the greatest *kindness to mortals;* but *no mind*—only animal instinct.

As the embryo of man has no more of the ape in it than of any other mammal, but *contains in itself the totality of all the kingdoms of nature,* and since it seems to be "a persistent type" of life, far more so than even the Foraminifera, it seems as illogical to make him evolve from the ape as it would be to trace his origin to the frog or the dog. Both Occult and Eastern philosophies believe in evolution, which Manu and Kapila give with far more clearness than any

scientist does at present. But no Occultist can accept the unreasonable proposition that all the now existing forms, "from the structureless Amœba to man," are the direct lineal descendants of organisms which lived millions and millions of years before the birth of man, in the pre-Silurian epochs, in the sea or land-mud. The Occultists believe in an *inherent law* of progressive *development* . . . checked and modified, however, by the *Law of Retardation,* which imposes a restriction on the advance of all species when a Higher Type makes its appearance.

It is not denied that in the preceding Round man *was* a gigantic ape-like creature; and when we say "man" we ought perhaps to say, the rough mould that was developing for the use of man in this Round only—the middle, or the transition point of which we have hardly reached. Nor was man what he is now during the first two and a half Root-races. That point he reached 18,000,000 years ago, during the secondary period, as we claim. Till then he was, according to tradition and Occult teaching, "a god on earth who had fallen into matter," or generation. This may or may not be accepted, since the Secret Doctrine does not impose itself as an infallible dogma; and since, whether its prehistoric records are accepted or rejected, it has nothing to do with the question of the *actual* man and his inner nature, the "Fall" having left no original sin on Humanity.

Furthermore, we are taught that the transformations through which man passed on the descending arc—which is centrifugal for spirit and centripetal for matter—and those he prepares to go through, henceforward, on his ascending path, which will reverse the direction of the two forces—viz., matter will become centrifugal and spirit centripetal—that all such transformations *are next in store for the anthropoid ape also,* all those, at any rate, who have reached the remove next to man in this Round—and these will all be men in the Fifth Round, as present men inhabited ape-like forms in the Third, the preceding Round.

Species and genera of the flora, fauna, and the highest animal, its crown—man, change and vary according to the environments and climatic variations, not only with every Round, but every Root-Race likewise, as well as after every geological cataclysm that puts an end to, or produces a turning point in the latter. In the Sixth Root-Race the fossils of the Orang, the Gorilla and the Chimpanzee will be those of extinct quadrumanous mammals; and new forms—

though fewer and ever wider apart as ages pass on and the close of the Manvantara approaches—will develop from the "cast off" types of the human races as they revert once again to the astral, out of the mire of physical, life. There were none before man, and they will be extinct before the Seventh Race develops. Karma will lead on the monads of the unprogressed men of our race and lodge them in the newly evolved human frames of the thus physiologically regenerated baboon. This will take place, of course, millions of years hence. But the picture of this cyclic precession of all that lives and breathes now on earth, of each species in its turn, is a true one, and needs no "special creation" or miraculous formation of man, beast, and plant *ex nihilo*. This is how Occult Science explains the absence of any link between ape and man, and shows the former evolving from the latter.

Thus, it is most important to remember that the *Egos* of the apes are entities compelled by their Karma to incarnate in the animal forms, which resulted from the bestiality of the *latest* Third and the earliest Fourth Race men. They are entities who had already reached the "human stage" before this Round . . . truly "speechless men," and will become speaking animals (or men of a lower order) in the Fifth Round, while the adepts of a certain school hope that some of the Egos of the apes of a higher intelligence will reappear at the close of the Sixth Root-Race.

Wisdom Above Intellect

The wisdom contained in the Bible and in other records of even older origin should give the champions of "emergent evolution" some pause for reflection. The human race may have existed on earth for millions of years while the great treasures of its culture may not be older than several millenniums. Still the fact remains that, almost as soon as man's spirit could fully express itself through the medium of his physical organism, its messages reflected memories of a world of supernal greatness and superintellectual wisdom. Were it true that the human spirit is merely a higher form of animal consciousness, its first recorded expressions could not have dealt with the *super*natural.

—Franz Winkler: *The Bridge Between Two Worlds*

ANALOGY FROM ART

AN interesting observation from the world of art can be turned to use by the student of philosophy. It is, indeed, in this way that it is possible to enrich an understanding of those principles which have been the object of study.

During the Middle Ages perhaps the most outstanding physical creations of man were the mighty cathedrals still admired by architects and craftsmen to today. Ornamenting them are windows whose stained glass is still a source of marvel. While the artisan of today has had the advantage of further centuries of study and practice, he has not achieved the result of the early glass makers. In an article published by Princeton University in its *Record of the Art Museum* (Vol. XXI, No. 2, 1962) the following statements appear:

> In almost every instance the color of the modern glass is murky in comparison with the crystal clarity of the old glass. This intensity and brilliance of color which thirteenth-century glass has in spite of its heavy exterior patina, is due to the reflections inside the glass itself, set up by the unevenly distributed flakes of coloration. This effect is totally lacking in modern glass in which the distribution of color is perfectly even. . . . Thirteenth-century glass is more translucent and passes considerably more light than the modern glass.

Given this fact, it is interesting to see what use can be made of it in philosophical terms. As an example to be used as an analogy, more than one interpretation occurs. In the first place we have the brilliance of color and the luminosity, which occur apparently as a result of what we might consider as imperfections—"unevenly distributed flakes of coloration." We think at once of the dual nature of the universe, of how it is suggested that there cannot be manifestation without the opposites. We would not know light without knowledge of darkness, and in a sense the one is present in the other. We could not judge a thing to be good if we did not have at least a memory of evil as a basis of comparison. Certainly in the world of art the element of contrast is present in any artistic creation which has distinctive character. The fuzzy outline or vague concept

is used by the sentimentalist, but scorned by the artist who has something decisive to say. And so in the stained glass, the red glows precisely because it is not uniform and achieves brilliance by virtue of what is incorrectly termed an imperfection.

Turning to the modern glass in which "the distribution of color is perfectly even"—we have here a mixture, an amalgam, which actually serves as a barrier to the passage of light. Certainly man is a composite creature, from the standpoint of Theosophy a sevenfold being. Unless there is a clear and distinct use by the ego of his instruments, a muddy or indecisive existence will result. In society, unless the various functions are sharply defined, a civilization can be brought to chaos. The rational principle when influenced by the emotions is not able to function according to its true nature. Hence it would seem that spiritual light, for example, can penetrate our lives only when there is, not a mixture, but a precipitation of the various elements of man's nature, when each part functions only in its own appropriate sphere.

Not everything made by man can be seen objectively. The mind is an active agent. At times it creates, spinning out from itself fantasy, dream, poetry. At other times it re-works what is presented to it, and in a sense transmutes the material with which it deals. Such an activity takes place when an analogy is found in some situation, event or operation—when an idea bridges the gap between two unrelated elements in one's consciousness and a truth is demonstrated more clearly thereby. It is not that the analogy "proves" the truth, but rather that it makes it more apparent, in a sense explains it in other and often unmistakable terms. The student finds that this use of analogy, this search for similarities, is a fascinating pursuit, one which enables him to apply the creative process to a further illumination of familiar truths.

on the lookout

"The Acquirement of Individuality"

In recent years Lookout has been noting the increasing appearance of theosophical perspectives in the writings of contemporary psychologists and some sociologists. Crucial to this development is the realization that, as Erich Fromm first put it, "Man Is Not A Thing." (Reprinted in THEOSOPHY 46:35.) During the early part of this century the prevailing account of man's nature was that of behaviorism—the view that "man" should be scientifically studied as simply a biological organism, however complex—and that what we pridefully call "individuality" is nothing more than the conditioned responses of a particular organism to environmental variables.

It was clear enough to William Q. Judge in 1893 that this materialistic bias would dominate for a time among the psychologists of the West. The basis for his unequivocal statement that "there is no Western Psychology worthy of the name" was a knowledge of the reactive karmic effects of superstitious, authority-ridden Christianity. "This lack of an adequate system of Psychology," Judge wrote, "is a natural consequence of the materialistic bias of Science and the paralyzing influence of dogmatic religion; the one ridiculing effort and blocking the way, the other forbidding investigation." But that this physicalist prejudice would persist, stultifying psychology as the science of the soul, was not the impression Mr. Judge intended. In closing the sixth chapter of *The Ocean of Theosophy* he said:

> As Mind is being evolved more and more as we proceed in our course along the line of the race development, there can be perceived underneath in all countries the beginning of the transition from the animal possessed of the germ of real mind to the man of mind complete. The theosophist sees all around him the evidence that the race mind is changing by enlargement, that the old days of dogmatism are gone and the "age of inquiry" has come, that the inquiries will grow louder year by year and the answers be required to satisfy the mind as it grows more and more, until at last, all dogmatism being ended, the race will be ready to face all problems, each man for himself, all working for the good of the whole.

The Pivotal Doctrine of Theosophy

H. P. Blavatsky's statement of the Third Fundamental of *The Secret Doctrine* provides the ground for Theosophical study of psychology:

> The third assertion of the Secret Doctrine teaches that no Soul can have an independent (conscious) existence before the spark has (a) passed through every elemental form of the phenomenal world of that Manvantara, and (b) acquired individuality, first by natural impulse, and then by self-induced and self-devised efforts (checked by its Karma), thus ascending through all the degrees of intelligence, from the lowest to the highest Manas.

This representation of what H.P.B. elsewhere calls "objective idealism" is here termed "the pivotal doctrine of the Esoteric philosophy," which "admits no privileges or special gifts in man, save those won by his own Ego through personal effort and merit throughout a long series of metempsychoses and reincarnations."

While it is clear that a being possessed of "the germ of mind" will not acquire a "mind complete" in the same way that he amasses possessions or personal virtues, the phrase is provocative in suggesting that the increase of awareness is not regulated by cosmic forces, but by the development of self-direction. As to the majority of mankind, Mr. Judge explains: "*Manas* is not fully active in the race, as Desire still is uppermost; in the next cycle of the human period *Manas* will be fully active."

Transition for the Individual

The psychologists to whom we now refer are concerned with evolution in the individual in terms of the capacity to express *individual* integrity—together with its corollary, which is a sense of individual *responsibility*. The *Saturday Review* for Jan. 8 (p. 84) presents a Yale psychiatrist's view of man as a perpetually self-transcending being, carrying within himself the potentiality of all the legendary heroes. The "hero" is one who is no longer guided by that sort of "natural impulse" which makes him dependent upon the beliefs of the group to which he belongs; he is, in other words, emerging into another dimension of awareness. His individuality becomes authentic, while his sense of responsibility for making his own decisions and holding himself accountable for them is manifest.

The psychiatrist to whom the *SR* refers is Kenneth Keniston, whose book, *The Uncommitted* (Harcourt, Brace & World, 1965),

is a study of "alienated" youth in America—the young who cannot accept the superficial values of the society in which they live. Dr. Keniston proposes that this sort of alienation can be a prelude to the development of independent ethical responsibility. Keniston points out that such alienation is not "imposed *on* men by an unjust economic system" but "chosen *by* men as their basic stance toward society." Robert Levin, who summarizes *The Uncommitted* for *SR*, remarks that "while *The Uncommitted* is a scholarly work, what gives it an additional dimension and transforms it into the curious, fascinating, and provocative book it turns out to be is that the author, unlike his subjects, commits himself to a point of view." In short, Dr. Keniston is saying that we may be witnessing among alienated and often confused youths of intelligence the emergence of "a new vision of life, a society that enjoys diversity and supports human fulfillment."

"Insight and Responsibility"

Keniston's point of view is reflected in a growing body of literature, as witness the writings of Abraham Maslow, Carl Rogers, Clark Moustakas, and Erik Erikson. Dr. Erikson has expressed the conviction, based upon an extensive practice of psychotherapy, that maturity can never be achieved *by* the therapist or by "behavioral engineering," but that it depends upon illuminations which come to the individual. (*Insight and Responsibility*: Norton, 1964.) Erikson's point can be made clearer by an operational distinction between "morality" and "ethics." The psychotherapist can, as he says, "distinguish variations in moral and ethical sensitivity in accordance with stages in the development of human conscience." Dr. Erikson continues, pointing out that one distinction between ethics and morals—as defined above—is that "morality" is essentially negative:

> I would propose that we consider *moral rules* of conduct to be based on a fear of *threats* to be forestalled. These may be outer threats of abandonment, punishment and public exposure, or a threatening inner sense of guilt, of shame or of isolation. In either case, the rationale for obeying a rule may not be too clear; it is the threat that counts. In contrast, I would consider *ethical rules* to be based on *ideals* to be striven for with a high degree of rational assent and with a ready consent to a formulated good, a definition of perfection, and some promise of self-realization. The moral and the ethical sense are different in their psychological dynamics, because the moral sense develops on an earlier, more immature level.

Individual Ethics and Group Morals

Returning to Dr. Keniston, we encounter a suggestive correlation with the implications of Madame Blavatsky's statement of "the pivotal doctrine of Esoteric philosophy." Dr. Keniston writes:

> By "morals" I will mean the socially learned, largely unconscious, relatively specific and apparently self-evident rules of right conduct in any community. When an individual violates his moral code, he feels guilt, the pangs of conscience experienced as a part of the "not-me," as an alien force that acts upon the conscious and experiencing self. Moral codes tend to be specific and situational: they tell us how to behave in defined kinds of situations. When a moral man acts morally, he often acts automatically and unreflectively: the power of his moral sense is shown by his imperviousness to temptation.
>
> By "ethics," however, I want to refer to the individual's thought-out, reflective and generalized sense of good and evil, the desirable and the undesirable, as integrated into his sense of himself and his view of the world. When an ethical man violates his own ethic, he feels not guilt but a sense of human failure, a kind of existential shame that he has not been who he thought himself to be. A man's conscience is commonly experienced as alien, but his ethical sense is a part (often the heart) of his central and best self. Moral codes tend to be specific and situational; but ethical principles are general and universal, seeking to provide guidelines for conduct in all possible situations. While morals tell us how to behave, ethics tells us what to aspire to. Therefore the central conflict of moral life is the struggle between instinct and morals; but the central tension of ethical life is the question of how to achieve one's ethical aims. ("Morals and Ethics," *American Scholar*, Autumn, 1965.)

"A Difference in Psychological Development"

The truly ethical man assumes a different and deeper responsibility. He must often hesitate, reflect and ponder, while the merely "moral" person simply obeys the rules and adopts the attitudes characteristic of his society. Dr. Keniston continues:

> All of this presupposes a difference in the psychological development of morals and ethics. Morals come first in life: anyone fortunate enough to have devoted parents who are minimally consistent in how they respond to him in childhood is likely to develop an ingrained sense of morals. Adolescence brings new powers of cognition and new feelings—a capacity for logico-deductive thought and an urge for self-consistency, an ability to locate oneself in time and a need for historical relatedness, a talent for self-regulation and a will to stand unaided. In the

process, there may develop the beginning of an ethical sense beyond morals, a sense of the desirable and the undesirable that embraces and is supported by remnants of the childish conscience, but that transcends it in abstractness, historical realism, and consistency with other commitments and conceptions of self. (Ibid.)

The Eternal Verity

The opening pages of H. P. Blavatsky's *Key to Theosophy* call attention to the psychological significance of the term "Theosophy" as related to the formation of the eclectic theosophical system in the third century. Ammonius Saccas and his disciples invited all men capable of philosophic thought to search for the "divine wisdom" underlying various systems of belief. *Systems* of thought are, in effect, moral codes; yet systems and codes are merely reflections of an individual's capacity for ethical vision and decision. As H.P.B. elsewhere states, the whole aim of our system is the evolution of the inner man. Contemporary expressions of man's need to find his own identity or individuality as a responsible moral agent include Abraham Maslow's account of the autonomous or self-actualizing person. In his widely influential text, *Motivation and Personality,* Maslow writes:

Self-actualizing people are independently ethical; that is, they derive their own ethical standards as differentiated from passively accepting standards established by society. Moreover, these people seem to be relatively free of the lies, hypocricies and inconsistencies of society.

These people are frequently, but not consistently, unconventional. They observe the rituals and traditions of society with a fair degree of good grace, primarily because they prefer not to hurt the feelings of other people. However, they do not permit convention to prevent them from doing something they feel is important. When they do act according to tradition it is voluntary and deliberate, but not because they feel any kind of compulsion.

Transcendental Philosophy and Ethics

Perceptions that the acquirement of this kind of "individuality" is indeed "pivotal," both for persons and collective humanity, are to be found clearly expressed by many thinkers of the American tradition. Emerson's essay "On Self-Reliance" and the stance and writings of Henry David Thoreau anticipated the emphases now characteristic of such psychologists as Fromm, Erikson, Keniston, and

Maslow. William James, generally regarded as America's first great psychologist, envisioned an eventual study of the self-transcending capacities of man. His *Principles of Psychology,* though chiefly concerned with the scientific study of the physiological factors which influence the mind, concluded with a flat statement on the limitations of physiological psychology:

> At present psychology is in the condition of physics before Galileo and the laws of motion, of chemistry before Lavoisier and the notion that mass is preserved in all reactions. The Galileo and the Lavoisier of psychology will be famous men indeed when they come, as come they some day surely will, or past successes are no index to the future. When they do come, however, the necessities of the case will make them "metaphysical."

"This Curve of the Cycle"

This prophecy is apparently beginning to be fulfilled by the appearance of men who are *manasic* psychologists concerned with the noëtic as well as with the psychic, and who see in the awakening of noëtic powers what William Q. Judge called a further "incarnation" of Manas, accelerating the "transition from the animal possessed of the germ of real mind to the man of mind complete." This awakening cannot be separated from a study of the "Third Proposition," which remains a key to a doctrine which is "secret" until the individual no longer relies upon authority in doctrine. A passage expressing this vision of "transformation of self" occurs in an article by Mr. Judge, which was published at the end of the first year of publication of his *Path* magazine:

> In this curve of the cycle, the final authority is *the man himself*. In former times the disclosed Vedas, and later, the teachings of the great Buddha, were the right authority, in whose authoritative teachings and enjoined practices were found the necessary steps to raise Man to an upright position. But the grand clock of the Universe points to another hour, and now Man must seize the key in his hands and himself—as a whole—open the gate. (THEOS. 36:277.)

Responsible Medical Research

The use of human beings as subjects for medical experiment is so widespread that the expression "human guinea pig" has become a cliché. According to the Wall Street *Journal* (Jan. 21) some long overdue karmic checks to this practice are on the eve of being enforced. The *Journal* reports:

A major decision that went practically unnoticed but which could affect medical research and patients all over the country was made here recently. The issue involved is whether patients must be fully informed, and their consent obtained, before they participate in research experiments. In many experiments, it's said, the information given patients about methods to be used and the risks involved is inadequate. In some cases, it's charged, the patients are only vaguely aware that they are even involved in an experiment.

The decision made here involves two physicians, one of them a scientist at the famed Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research. The doctors directed an experiment in which live cancer cells were injected into non-cancerous patients. The doctors asserted that the patients had consented to injections, but they conceded that they hadn't told the patients the shots contained live cancer cells.

Unprofessional Conduct

The purpose of the injection was to prove that non-cancerous persons have an immunity against cancer. In the instant case, nineteen patients suffering diseases other than cancer were experimented upon. They were merely told they were being injected to ascertain their resistance to disease and that a lump would appear and then would go away in a few weeks. This did occur, and the patients were apparently unharmed. The doctors were brought before the New York State Board of Regents, whose rulings in professional activities carry the force of law. In a unanimous decision the Regents ruled that the doctors were "guilty of fraud or deceit in the practice of medicine" and "unprofessional conduct." The Regents suspended the medical licenses of the two but stayed execution of the sentence, placing the doctors on probation for one year. The *Journal* states:

The case seems bound to become a landmark in the area of patient consent to experimental procedures; there are practically no other legal decisions in the U.S. on this point. . . . The New York case's impact on patients could be great. The Regents found evidence of "an attitude on the part of some physicians that they can go ahead and do anything which they conclude is good for the patient, or which is of benefit experimentally or educationally and is not harmful to the patient, and that the patient's consent is an empty formality. With this," the Regents added, "we cannot agree. . . . A patient has the right to know he is being asked to volunteer and to refuse to participate in an experiment for any reason, intelligent or otherwise, well-informed or prejudiced. A physician has no right to withhold

from a prospective volunteer any fact which he knows may influence the decision."

When is an Experiment Safe?

While the Regents' decision decided the cancer injection case, it left unanswered a number of questions involving patient consent that are bound to arise in the future. The Wall Street *Journal* indicates some of these problems:

> The Regents ruled that the patient must be told anything that might affect his decision. One thing that would surely affect it would be the risk entailed in an experiment. But the risks aren't always known. It is the nature of research that it involves innovation. To some extent, then, it is a venture into the unknown, with dangers perhaps equally unknown.
>
> Even if the risks are known, some doctors feel that they and other elements of the experiment can't always be adequately explained to patients. . . . [The subjects'] lack of technical knowledge coupled with the usual trust placed in the doctor will lead most patients to consent to almost any proposal. [Thus] leaving the decision up to the doctor who is carrying on the research isn't particularly safe. A scientist may get so carried away with his work that he becomes blind to the risks involved for the patients. One medical man has said that "people in research do not always realize . . . that part of their vocational outfit is an extraordinary capacity for concentrating on one object at a time. When one of them tells me that a clinical experiment must be all right because he would not hesitate to do it on his wife and children, I am not, alas, at all reassured."

Self-Sacrificial Research

Certain controls are suggested such as the establishment of committees to pass upon experiments, although the *Journal* admits that "neither a single expert nor a committee can ferret out risks when they're unknown." It is instructive and humbling to contrast modern methods with those used by the great homeopathic physicians such as Hahnemann and his successors, and in this century, Edward Bach. Dr. Bach tested all his remedies upon himself and in the process frequently suffered severe distress. He thus was able not only to protect his patients but to obtain direct knowledge of the effect on the human constitution of certain substances. Obviously no doctor who relies upon the reports of the lay patient can be as adequately informed.

Hahnemann wrote: "Medicines on which depend mens' life and

death, disease and health, must be thoroughly and most carefully distinguished from one another, and for this purpose tested by careful pure experiments on the healthy body to ascertain their power and real effect." He held that the testing of drugs on sick people admits of too many chances of error and therefore avails little or nothing in exact science. Hahnemann, became an adept in the art of drug-proving, and during his life he proved about ninety drugs upon himself.

The theosophic emphasis, of course, is on the recognition by the physician (even in testing on one's self) of the complexity and intricacy of the human organism as a whole, and on the relation of the physiological functions to the mind-being. Man is not a *thing;* and *he* is not his disease.

Vol. I of H.P.B.'s Works

The first volume of the series entitled Collected Writings of H. P. Blavatsky, long out of print, is now once more available. Much of the original stock of this volume, which includes H.P.B.'s writings from 1874 to 1878, was destroyed in the London "blitz" during World War II. The present version of the volume is a revised edition with much new material added by the editor, Boris de Zirkoff. Copies may be purchased from *Theosophia,* 551 South Oxford St., Los Angeles, Calif. 90005, at $6.50.